

# Expectation Formation in a Simple New Keynesian DSGE Framework: A Comparative Analysis of Behavioral and Rational Expectations in the Indian Context

Arpan Chakraborty\*

November 27, 2024

## Abstract

The Dynamic Stochastic General Equilibrium (DSGE) model has become a cornerstone of macroeconomic analysis, yet research in emerging economies like India remains limited. This study makes a significant contribution by introducing behavioral expectation formation into a New Keynesian DSGE model of the Indian economy, a novel approach absent in existing literature. While previous studies have exclusively employed rational expectations, this research comparatively examines behavioral and rational expectation frameworks. Using the output gap and the inflation rate, we find nuanced differences in model performance: behavioral expectations more effectively capture the constructed output gap characteristics, while rational expectations capture the inflation dynamics better. These findings have critical implications for future macroeconomic modeling and policy design, suggesting context-specific expectation formation strategies.

**Keywords:** Behavioral Macroeconomics, Indian economy, DSGE models

**JEL Classification:** E12, E70, E71

---

\*Corresponding author. PhD Scholar, Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Kharagpur, West Bengal, India, arpan.ms97@kgpian.iitkgp.ac.in, ORCID - 0000-0002-7777-5643

# 1 Introduction

The Dynamic Stochastic general equilibrium model (DSGE model) is the workhorse of modern macroeconomics. However, the DSGE literature has extensively focused on explaining business cycles in developed economies, while studies on emerging economies (such as India) remain sparse due to the unique frictions and distortions these economies face. In the Indian context, DSGE research is even more limited. Early contributions include Peiris, Saxegaard, and Anand (2010), who estimated a small open economy DSGE model with macro-finance linkages for India, incorporating a financial accelerator and dual-currency borrowing. Using Bayesian estimation on data from 1996 to 2008, they explored macro-finance interactions. Gabriel et al. (2011) enhanced the model by including the informal sector and credit-constrained consumers, demonstrating improved model fit with these additions.

Subsequent studies aimed to address specific objectives. Banerjee, Basu, and Ghate (2020) analyzed the weak aggregate demand channel in India's monetary policy transmission using a New Keynesian DSGE model, highlighting the informal sector as a hindrance to effective monetary policy transmission. Sarkar (2020, 2022) explored the interplay between the stock market and economic growth, as well as the economic impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, incorporating migration disruptions, supply shocks, and demand constraints. His results underscored the importance of monetary transfers in mitigating unemployment and boosting output. Shah and Garg (2023) evaluated post-pandemic policy responses, finding expansionary monetary policy effective on both demand and supply sides, whereas fiscal policy impacts were demand-centric. Sharma and Behera (2022) demonstrated the superiority of DSGE models over traditional HP filters for analyzing the output gap in post-pandemic recovery. Kumar (2023) analyzed the effects of productivity and monetary policy shocks in India, showing that a positive productivity shock enhances economic activity, while an expansionary monetary policy shock has only short-term effects on output.

To the best of the authors' knowledge, no prior work has implemented New Keynesian DSGE modeling in the Indian context using behavioral expectation formation. All previous contributions, including the works mentioned above, have exclusively utilized rational expectations, which assume that agents are omniscient. While this framework has been insightful, it may not adequately capture the frictions of developing economies like India.

This paper makes a novel contribution by being the first to conduct a comparative study of behavioral and rational expectations in the context of the Indian economy. Following the earlier works of literature on behavioral macroeconomics by De Grauwe (2012),

De Grauwe and Ji (2019), and De Grauwe and Foresti (2023), this paper incorporates behavioral expectation formation in a simple NK model to identify which expectation formation can better fit the data<sup>1</sup>. The analysis reveals that behavioral expectations capture the constructed output gap data characteristics more effectively, while rational expectations better explain inflation dynamics. This distinction implies that future research focusing on inflation targeting and monetary policy should prioritize rational expectations, whereas studies aiming to minimize output volatility should adopt behavioral expectations.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 describes the data, Section 3 introduces the simple NK model, Section 4 depicts the results, and finally, Section 5 concludes.

## 2 Data

The primary challenge faced by this paper lies in data collection, particularly for the output gap of the Indian economy. Unlike developed economies, real output gap data for India is not directly available and is typically estimated using various techniques. However, this paper adopts a simplified approach to address this limitation. Quarterly real GDP data for the Indian economy was sourced from FRED<sup>2</sup>. Using this dataset<sup>3</sup>, the output gap was approximated by calculating  $\ln(Y_t/\bar{Y})$ , where  $\bar{Y}$  represents the average real GDP over the entire time span. While this constructed measure does not represent the true output gap—since it relies on the average real GDP rather than potential GDP—it provides a straightforward perspective on the output gap’s dynamics.

For inflation, the dataset was obtained from the Reserve Bank of India (RBI) and covers the period from January 2014 to April 2024. Quarterly observations of the combined inflation rate for the Indian economy were used to align with the analysis.

Note that the moments of the output gap data are compared with the simulated data spanning the 1000th to 1077th observations of the simulated output gap. Similarly, the inflation rate is compared against the simulated data from the 1000th to 1041th observations, corresponding to the 42 quarters of available inflation rate data.

---

<sup>1</sup>Note that, this paper uses the behavioral expectation as it can match the higher order moments of the output gap and the inflation rate of the US economy.

<sup>2</sup><https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/NGDPRNSAXDCINQ>

<sup>3</sup>The output gap data ranges from 1st quarter 2004 to the 3rd quarter 2023.

### 3 The Model

As described in the introduction, this paper employs the behavioral New Keynesian (NK) macroeconomic framework developed by De Grauwe and Ji (2019) in the context of the Indian economy. The Aggregate Demand (AD) equation is as follows:

$$y_t = \tilde{E}_t(y_{t+1}) - \frac{1}{\sigma}(i_t - \tilde{E}_t(\pi_{t+1})) + \varepsilon_t; \quad t = 1, 2, 3, \dots \quad (1)$$

where,  $y_t$  denotes the output gap,  $i_t$  is the short-term nominal interest rate, and

$$\varepsilon_t = \rho_\varepsilon \varepsilon_{t-1} + \epsilon_{\varepsilon,t} \quad (2)$$

where  $\epsilon_{\varepsilon,t} \sim N(0, 0.5)$  follows a normal distribution with mean zero and variance 0.5, and  $\rho_\varepsilon$  represents the autoregressive parameter of the AD shock (See; Kumar (2023)). The expectations in this model are non-rational.

The Phillips curve/AS equation, derived under monopolistic competition and Calvo pricing (Calvo, 1983), is expressed as:

$$\pi_t = \beta \tilde{E}_t(\pi_{t+1}) + \kappa y_t + \eta_t \quad (3)$$

where,  $0 \leq \kappa \leq 1$  measures the sensitivity of inflation to the output gap,  $\beta$  measures the discount rate, and  $\pi_t$  is the inflation rate. Also, similar to the AD shock, I introduce,

$$\eta_t = \rho_\eta \eta_{t-1} + \epsilon_{\eta,t} \quad (4)$$

where  $\epsilon_{\eta,t} \sim N(0, 0.5)$  follows a normal distribution with mean zero and variance 0.5, and  $\rho_\eta$  represents the autoregressive parameter of the AS shock. Following De Grauwe and Ji (2020), the parameter  $\kappa$  can be expressed as:

$$\kappa = \frac{(1 - \theta)(1 - \beta\theta) \sigma(1 - \varsigma) + \chi + \varsigma}{\theta} \frac{1}{1 - \varsigma + \varsigma \acute{e}}$$

where  $1 - \theta$  reflects the expected price of the Calvo lottery ticket,  $\chi$  denotes the inverse Frisch elasticity of labor supply in the household utility function,  $\varsigma$  represents the labor elasticity in the monopolistically competitive labor-augmented production function,  $[Y_t^i = A_t L_t^{1-\varsigma, i}]$ , and  $\acute{e}$  is the price elasticity of demand, which determines the markup price,  $M$ , for monopolistically competitive firms,  $[M = \frac{\acute{e}}{\acute{e}-1}]$  (see Galí, 2008).

A fraction  $\theta$  of firms cannot adjust prices in each period. For  $\theta = 1$ ,  $b_2$  equals zero, indicating highly rigid prices, while for  $\theta = 0$ ,  $b_2$  approaches infinity.

The short-term nominal interest rate ( $i_t$ ) is set according to the Taylor rule (Taylor, 1993; Blattner and Margaritov, 2010):

$$i_t = (1 - c_3)(c_1\pi_t + c_2y_t) + c_3i_{t-1} + u_t \quad (5)$$

where the Taylor rule shock,  $u_t$ , follows the process:

$$u_t = \rho_u u_{t-1} + \epsilon_{u,t} \quad (6)$$

with  $\epsilon_{u,t} \sim N(0, 0.5)$  being a normally distributed error term with mean zero and variance 0.5,  $\rho_u$  representing the autoregressive parameter of the shock, and  $c_1 > 1$ ,  $0 < c_2 < 1$  are the coefficients governing inflation and output gap responses, respectively. Note that, the term  $c_3$  captures interest rate smoothing.

### 3.1 Behavioral Expectation Formation

Following De Grauwe and Ji (2019), the behavioral expectations model includes fundamentalist and extrapolator agents. Expectations for a variable (it can be output gap or inflation rate)  $x_t$  are given by:

$$\tilde{E}_t(x_{t+1}) = \alpha_{f,t}^x \tilde{E}_t^f(x_{t+1}) + \alpha_{e,t}^x \tilde{E}_t^e(x_{t+1})$$

where fundamentalists expect  $\tilde{E}_t^f(x_{t+1}) = x_{ss}$ ,<sup>4</sup> and extrapolators use  $\tilde{E}_t^e(x_{t+1}) = x_{t-1}$ .

The proportions  $\alpha_{f,t}^x$  and  $\alpha_{e,t}^x$  are determined based on the relative forecast performance, which is evaluated using their mean square forecast errors:

$$U_{f,t} = - \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \varrho_k \left[ x_{t-k-1} - \tilde{E}_{f,t-k-2}^f(x_{t-k-1}) \right]^2$$

$$U_{e,t} = - \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \varrho_k \left[ x_{t-k-1} - \tilde{E}_{e,t-k-2}^e(x_{t-k-1}) \right]^2$$

where  $\varrho_k = (1 - \rho)\rho^k$ , with  $0 < \rho < 1$  as the memory parameter. The proportion of fundamentalists is given by:

$$\alpha_{f,t}^x = \frac{\exp(\gamma U_{f,t})}{\exp(\gamma U_{f,t}) + \exp(\gamma U_{e,t})}, \quad \alpha_{e,t}^x = 1 - \alpha_{f,t}^x$$

where  $\gamma$  is the willingness to learn/intensity of choice parameter.

---

<sup>4</sup>which is normalized to be zero.

## 3.2 Simulation Parameters

Table 1 lists the simulation parameters, aligned with the papers described below:

Table 1: Simulation Parameters for the Indian Economy

Parameter	Description and Source
$\kappa = 0.065$	Output gap coefficient in AS (Calculated using the formula)
$\beta = 0.98$	Discount factor (Gabriel et al., 2012)
$\acute{e} = 7.01$	Price elasticity of demand (Gabriel et al., 2012)
$\sigma = 1.5$	CRRA of household consumption (Das and Nath, 2019; Gabriel et al., 2012)
$\varsigma = 0.7$	Share of labor in production function (Banerjee, Basu, and Ghate, 2020)
$\chi = 2.7$	Inverse of Frisch elasticity of labor supply (Anand and Prasad, 2010; Sharma and Behera, 2022)
$\theta = 0.75$	Calvo price rigidity (Kumar, 2023)
$c_1 = 1.2$	Interest rate sensitivity of inflation (Gabriel et al., 2012)
$c_2 = 0.5$	Interest rate sensitivity of output (Banerjee, Basu, and Ghate, 2020)
$c_3 = 0.8$	Interest rate smoothing parameter (Banerjee, Basu, and Ghate, 2020)
$\gamma = 2$	Learning intensity (De Grauwe and Ji, 2019)
$\rho = 0.5$	Memory parameter (De Grauwe and Ji, 2019)
$T = 2000$	Simulation length
$\rho_\varepsilon = 0.95$	Autoregressive parameter for AD shock (Kumar, 2023)
$\rho_\eta = 0.95$	Autoregressive parameter for AS shock
$\rho_u = 0.95$	Autoregressive parameter for Taylor rule shock (Kumar, 2023)

It is important to note that this study does not have the calibrated values for the memory parameter and the willingness-to-learn parameter specific to the Indian economy. Therefore, this paper uses the parameters given by De Grauwe and Ji (2019). Additionally, unlike Kumar (2023), this paper incorporates aggregate supply (AS) shocks into the analysis.

## 4 Results

Following De Grauwe and Ji (2019, 2020), Table 2 shows that the Behavioral NK model is more adept at capturing the output gap data of the Indian economy. The rational expectations model, which assumes agents are omniscient, fails to account for the complexities in the observed data, particularly in skewness and kurtosis. Hence, we can say,

Table 2: Statistical Comparison of various Expectations: Output gap

Measure	Behavioral Expectation	Rational Expectation	Actual Data
Kurtosis	1.52	2.89	1.91
Skewness	-0.20	0.50	-0.27
Autocorrelation	0.99	0.92	0.98

1. **Kurtosis:** The kurtosis for behavioral expectations (1.52) is closer to the actual data (1.91) compared to rational expectations (2.89). This suggests that behavioral expectations better capture the actual data’s tail behavior and distributional characteristics.
2. **Skewness:** The skewness of behavioral expectations (-0.20) aligns more closely with the actual data (-0.27) than rational expectations (0.50), indicating that behavioral expectations better represent the asymmetry observed in real-world data.
3. **Autocorrelation:** Behavioral expectations (0.99) and rational expectations (0.92) both closely approximate the autocorrelation of the actual data (0.98). However, behavioral expectations demonstrate equal performance in this regard.

Note that, both the models are simulated using the identical shock structure and numerical methods <sup>5</sup>.

Table 3: Statistical Comparison of various Expectations: Inflation Rate

Measure	Behavioral Expectation	Rational Expectation	Actual Data
Kurtosis	2.95	1.74	2.33
Skewness	-1.16	-0.34	0.30
Autocorrelation	0.99	0.93	0.63

Based on the statistical evidence in Table 3, the following inferences can be drawn:

1. **Rational expectations outperform behavioral expectations** in approximating the moments of the actual inflation data. This is particularly evident in the measures of skewness and autocorrelation, where rational expectations align more closely with the observed data than behavioral expectations<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>5</sup>Following De Grauwe (2012), the Binder and Pesaran (2000) method is employed to generate the results. For further details on the comparison of rational and behavioral expectations for the US, please refer to the MATLAB code provided by De Grauwe (2012).

<sup>6</sup>The analysis compares this data with quarterly observations, as these models are typically calibrated using quarterly data. For a similar calibration applied to the US economy, see De Grauwe and Ji (2019).

2. **Behavioral expectations capture extreme events better.** The higher kurtosis under behavioral expectations reflects a stronger ability to model fat tails or extreme fluctuations, which may be significant in certain contexts with a larger inflation rate dataset.

It is important to note that, unlike the U.S. economy, the actual output gap, inflation rate, and the simulated output gap and inflation rate—obtained by implementing the simple New Keynesian model under both behavioral and rational expectations—exhibit normality at the 99% level of significance, as verified by the Jarque-Bera (JB) test.

## 5 Conclusion

This study demonstrates that the Behavioral New Keynesian (NK) model performs remarkably well in capturing the statistical properties of macroeconomic variables for the Indian economy, aligning with findings from studies on the U.S. economy (e.g., De Grauwe and Ji, 2019, 2020). In particular, the behavioral expectation framework effectively replicates the distributional characteristics of the output gap and inflation rate, showing its potential to outperform the Rational Expectations (RE) model in key areas such as kurtosis and skewness.

While the Rational Expectations model aligns more closely with the observed data regarding skewness and autocorrelation for inflation, the Behavioral Expectations model’s superior performance in capturing extreme events (fat tails) highlights its robustness in dynamic macroeconomic modeling. These findings suggest that future research should prioritize further exploration and refinement of Behavioral Expectations frameworks for policy modeling, especially in the context of emerging economies like India.

### 5.1 Limitations and Future Directions

This analysis is subject to several limitations. First, the absence of actual output gap data for the Indian economy necessitated the construction of a proxy measure using quarterly real GDP data obtained from FRED. Future research should utilize more comprehensive and accurate output gap data for India to enhance the robustness of the results.

Second, the limited availability of combined inflation rate data for India (42 quarterly observations) constrains the analysis. Expanding the dataset to include more observations will improve the generalization of the findings.



## References

- [1] Anand, R., and Prasad, E. (2010), Optimal price indices for targeting inflation under incomplete markets, *IMF Working Papers*, 10(200), 1. <https://doi.org/10.5089/9781455205301.001>.
- [2] Banerjee, S., Basu, P., and Ghate, C. (2020), A monetary business cycle model for India, *Economic Inquiry*, 58(3), 1362–1386. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecin.12855>.
- [3] Binder, M., and Pesaran, H. (2000), Solution of finite-horizon multivariate linear rational expectations models and sparse linear systems, *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 24(3), 325–346. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-1889\(99\)00008-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-1889(99)00008-1).
- [4] Blattner, T. S., and Margaritov, E. (2010), Towards a robust monetary policy rule for the euro area, *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1617252>
- [5] Calvo, G. A. (1983), Staggered prices in a utility-maximizing framework, *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 12:383–398.
- [6] Das, R., and Nath, S. (2019), Capital misallocation and its implications for India’s potential GDP: Evidence from India KLEMS, *Indian Economic Review*, 54(2). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41775-019-00055-4>.
- [7] De Grauwe, P. (2012), *Lectures on behavioral macroeconomics*, Princeton University Press. <https://press.princeton.edu/books/hardcover/9780691147390/lectures-on-behavioral-macroeconomics>
- [8] De Grauwe, P., and Ji, Y. (2019), *Behavioural Macroeconomics: Theory and Policy*, Oxford University Press, UK.
- [9] De Grauwe, P., and Ji, Y. (2020), Structural reforms, animal spirits, and monetary policies, *European Economic Review*, 124, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroecorev.2020.103395>
- [10] De Grauwe, P., and Foresti, P. (2023), Interactions of fiscal and monetary policies under waves of optimism and pessimism, *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 212, 466–481. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2023.05.024>
- [11] Gabriel, V., Levine, P., Pearlman, J., & Yang, B. (2012), An estimated dsge model of the indian economy, In: C. Ghate (Ed.), *The Oxford Hand-*

- book of the Indian Economy*, 1st ed., 835–890. Oxford University Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199734580.013.0029>
- [12] Galí, J. (2008), *Monetary policy, inflation, and the business cycle: An introduction to the new Keynesian framework*, Princeton University Press.
- [13] Kumar, A. (2023), A basic two-sector new keynesian dsge model of the indian economy, *Theoretical and Practical Research in the Economic Fields*, 14(1), 36.  
[https://doi.org/10.14505/tpref.v14.1\(27\).04](https://doi.org/10.14505/tpref.v14.1(27).04)
- [14] Peiris, S., Saxegaard, M., and Anand, R. (2010), An estimated model with macrofinancial linkages for India, *IMF Working Paper*, 10(21), 1.  
<https://doi.org/10.5089/9781451962321.001>
- [15] Sarkar, A. (2020), Understanding the short-run relationship between stock market and growth in emerging economies, *Journal of Quantitative Economics*, 18(2).  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s40953-019-00183-x>.
- [16] Sarkar, A. (2022), Understanding the COVID economic crisis: A short-run general equilibrium framework, *South Asian Journal of Macroeconomics and Public Finance*, 11(2), 217–245. <https://doi.org/10.1177/22779787221097787>.
- [17] Shah, S. A., and Garg, B. (2023), Testing policy effectiveness during COVID-19: An NK-DSGE analysis, *Journal of Asian Economics*, 84, 101577.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asieco.2022.101577>.
- [18] Sharma, S., and Behera, H. (2022), A dissection of Indian growth using a DSGE filter, *Journal of Asian Economics*, 80, 101480.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asieco.2022.101480>.
- [19] Taylor, J. B. (1993), Discretion versus policy rules in practice, *Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series on Public Policy*, 39, 195–214. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-2231\(93\)90009-L](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-2231(93)90009-L)